LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

ENTERED AT THE CHICAGO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.

PRICE FIVE CENTS. CHICAGO, AUGUST 2, E. M. 306 [C. E. 1906]. WHOLE NO. 1071

THE GREAT CONSPIRACY.

In a circular sent out to the public to show up some of the outrages perpetrated against the freedom of the press the writer says:

"There is more in this obscenity law than appears on the surface. It is the work of the church, professedly in the interest of good morals, but really to get control of the postal department of the government and establish a censorship which will aid it in perpetuating its own power."

That there has been a deliberate conspiracy is evidently true, but the church is not alone in it. It is the combined effort of the enemies of liberty in both church and state, and the people at large have been kept in ignorance of the same. True, the obscenity law is the legitimate child of New England puritanism, but Protestants themselves have, for the most part, grown entirely away from the narrowness of their puritanic ancestors. Only a few of the relicts, like Anthony Comstock, remain, and they have succeeded because the church at large has no idea of the purpose involved.

Even the Catholic leaders dare not trust the masses of their membership with their real purpose, and, being aware of the liberalizing tendency of a free atmosphere, they all make false accusations and by the aid of the law keep the great public from knowing what it is they have called obscene. With money at their command to buy judges and jurors, they practically say: We have pronounced the matter obscene, and you dare not undeceive the public by republishing and sending it broadcast.

Therefore, obscenity trials are in that sense secret tribunals, and lying ones at that, as the condemned matter is not what has been considered obscene, but by declaring it so the great public believes it to be the same.

But present events demand a review of the past, of the steps taken to secure our present censorship. I had thought the obscenity law the first step, but when I learned that congress had given the right of private judgment to postal officials as to what might and might not pass through the mails I knew that that, if not the first step, was a very important one. It is a direct bid to the opponents of a free press to seek official places in the postal department.

But whatever the first step may have been, there is one which none but the plotters themselves could even have dreamed that it led in the direction of suppression, and yet without it there would have been no excuse for such censorship as we now have, and that is the cent a pound postage law. This was said to be in the line of the public good, and all went well for a time. Publishers deposited their papers in the mail without question or criticism.

But it was soon found that business men were establishing advertising sheets; that in this and other ways the cheap postage law was being taken advantage of, and this furnished the excuse for a series of questions which must be satisfactorily answered and sworn to before a cheap postage permit could be had. This result was just what the plotters expected and planned for; they understood the greed of the business world. The scheme worked to a charm; it furnished, as has been said, a satisfactory excuse for the series of questions which were the beginning of our present censorship.

This, as far as I know, was the first attempt of the government to regulate the business of newspaper publishers, but with their pottage of cheap postage the general press was blind to its far-reaching significance, and even liberal thinkers failed to realize that it was a trap. They failed to see that in giving the number of subscribers and sending copy of paper to Washington, as they must before being allowed second-class rate of postage, they thus furnished the enemies of freedom the name, character and strength of every radical paper in the nation.

Time is showing the meaning of all this, for now, if a publisher is known to be opposed to the prevailing religious, political or social regime, the subscription list must not only be sworn to but must be verified. The list is demanded, names taken therefrom, the parties written to asking if they are subscribers, and the applicant is required to show the letters written by subscribers ordering the paper and sending remittances for the same, as is shown by Benj. F. Tucker in giving an account in "Liberty" of his struggle to get second-class postage for it.

Upon presenting his request he was asked: "What proof have you that this is a bona fide list of paying subscribers? Can you show the letters containing remittances in which your subscribers ordered the paper?" When furnished with such letters, many of which were from personal friends and contained much personal matter, this tool of the plotters read them from beginning to end in Mr. Tucker's presence. One from an old friend began with: "I send you $3 for a year's subscription."

"How is this?" he was asked. "Three dollars is not the subscription price."

"The gentleman sent an excess, desiring to contribute to the paper's growth," replied Mr. Tucker.

Prompt came the next question, "And what did you do with the money?"

"Placed it with the paper's receipts."

"You did not appropriate it to sending the paper to other individuals?"

"Not in special; all receipts are used in paying the general expenses," and thus this petty examination continued to the end.

Mr. Tucker says: "This occurred early in January. I heard nothing more until near the middle of February. Then I began to receive from my subscribers in different parts of the country elaborate, regularly printed circulars which had been sent to them from Washington by the department asking them a set series of questions concerning their subscription to 'Liberty,' how much they paid, how they paid it, if any extra inducements were held out to secure their subscriptions, etc., etc."

Quite a difference between now and when the cent a pound rate was first established. Then, as before said, it only needed to take your papers to the office, have them weighed and pay the postage. Now second-class postage means the right to demand of a publisher his private letters for official inspection; it means the right to demand what a publisher does with extra money sent by friends; it means the right to demand for official inspection the subscription list; it means the right to insult a publisher by refusing to accept his sworn statement and of appealing to his subscribers as to the truth of what he says.

Had all this been claimed at first the people would have been so indignant that the whole matter would have been overhauled at the very next session of congress, but little by little the cords have been tightened until now, unless all questions are satisfactorily answered, sworn to and confirmed by outside testimony, it means the highest postage paid or the suppression of all radical papers. Yes, the highest postage paid, for letter postage is only 32 cents per pound, and to pay a cent a copy for some of our small radical papers would be from 36 to 40 cents per pound. And if, after the publisher has been sufficiently humiliated, he succeeds in obtaining

second-class rates, he must still be subjected to the same degrading espionage.

It is a direct discrimination, not in law but in fact, against publishers of radical thought; an indirect but none the less real attempt to suppress all such papers as far as is possible. The law, it is true, applies to all, but the general press would not stand such espionage for a moment, and as congress has given postal officials the right of private judgment they of course leave all papers alone but such as they wish to annoy.

It is because they can so handle the sex question as to arouse the prejudices of the people that they have made use of that as the first step toward press censorship, and not because they are seeking sex purity. When shown an extract from Alice B. Stockham's "Tokology," "Of course it's obscene," said the attorney for the postal department; "all discussion of sex is obscene; there is no need to talk of such matters except between physicians and their patients." Mrs. Stockham is a physician, and what she has written is between her and that great, suffering patient, Humanity.

Attorney-General Goodwin, in saying what he did, practically tells every postal clerk in the nation that all works on sex may be thrown out. He is as rabid as the slaveholder was against anti-slavery publications, and in the end his efforts will be equally fruitless. The pioneers of progress are searching for the laws of nature, which, if obeyed, will give us heaven on earth, and neither the prison nor the gallows will deter them from trying to find what it is that poisons the life-fountain.

But our postal censors were not satisfied in getting the number and strength of all "heretic" papers—they wanted also the names of the subscribers. It was several years before this was called for, but now they are getting them through the law which gives the postmaster the right to demand the subscription list for inspection.

Do you think all this has been a happen-so? Do you think there is no plan, no plotting, behind it? There certainly is and has been from the first, and there are other steps contemplated. What they are I do not clearly see, but I should as soon think of a serpent stopping on its way to its intended victim as of these conspirators leaving things as they are. There is a time coming, unless there is a stop put to the onward march of this imperialistic power, when no letter, book or package can be sent through the mail unless it has upon it the name of the sender.

This would be all right if the postal department was simply a public carrier, but as a moral censor it is quite another thing. There are many in San Francisco, Cal., who remember the case of young Price, who was sent to San Quintin for a year for mailing an obscene pamphlet, and he positively asserts that he never saw the pamphlet until he saw it in court; did not know till then that there was such a pamphlet in existence.

Now, what is to be done about this state of things? It seems to me sometimes as if our revolutionary fathers must rise from their graves to confront their degenerate sons—such servility, such a rendering up of the people's individual rights for a few cents postage! Where is the self-respect of our newspaper fraternity, that they submit to such a degradation of their manhood—degradation so long as such a law stands upon the statute book, whether enforced or not!

As I see things there should be a concerted effort to place the postal department where it belongs as a public carrier, a public servant. Its moral sponsorship should be taken from it and left with the states. Then there could be no censorship to destroy the freedom of the press. Friends of freedom, wake up and act if you wish even a shadow of our liberties to be preserved.

LOIS WAISBROOKER.

EXCESSIVE MULTIPLICATION.

Little improvement can be expected in morality until the production of large families is regarded with the same feeling as drunkenness or any other physical excess. When persons are once married, the idea in this country never seems to enter any one's mind that having or not having a family, or the number of which it shall consist, is amenable to their own control. One would imagine that children were rained down upon married people direct from heaven, without their having art or part in the matter; that it was really, as the common phrases have it, God's will, and not their own, which decided the number of their offspring.—*John Stuart Mill.*

The misery of the people is not caused by individuals, but by an order of society by which they are bound together in a way that puts them in the power of a few.—*Leo Tolstoi.*

DIVISION OF ACCESSIONS
JUN 21 1943
RECEIVED

VARIOUS REMARKS.

In the "Woman's Journal" of June 30 Henry B. Blackwell has an article headed "Variety the Spice of Life." He thinks that women have very dull lives, and that they need variety to make them happy. He quotes a Burman, who says: "In Burmah for breakfast we eat rice; for dinner we eat rice; for supper, rice; and for dessert—rice. When we want a change of diet we eat—rice." Mr. Blackwell thinks that this is like a woman's life, and that great changes are needed, but he does not mention the particular things that he would like to see women have variety in. Mr. Blackwell is getting on to dangerous ground. He had better be careful if he does not wish the "Woman's Journal" to be excluded from the mails.

* * *

The disturbances which the suffragettes are making in England are a great event in the history of women. Never before has such an insubordinate disposition been publicly displayed by a number of women. Until lately the woman-suffrage movement in England was as respectable and feeble an affair as that of the United States. It was composed of "ladies." At the election in February, however, a new organization composed of "women" appeared upon the scene, invaded all the meetings, and insisted on getting a precise statement from each candidate as to how he stood on woman suffrage. Some eminent personages refused to answer, and when the women insisted they were forcibly removed from the meetings. This excited wide sympathy among male voters, and resulted in some of the leading politicians being hooted off the platform, while others were held up until they gave a definite answer. The upshot was that 407 of the 670 members of the house of commons were frightened into promising to vote for woman suffrage, including the leaders of all the four parties in the house. When the matter came up in the house, however, there was very little time for discussion, and several obstructionists tried to talk it out. When it was clear that it could not go through a number of women in the gallery made a noisy demonstration, waving a flag and hurling epithets of opprobrium at their opponents down below, greatly to the horror of the British people.

Since then the suffragettes have been active all the time, until now four of them have been sent to jail. Teresa Billington got two months for striking a policeman. She refused to make any defense in court, on the ground that she did not recognize man-made laws and courts as having any authority over her. Annie Kenney, who was sent to jail during the election, has again got six weeks.

Every one admits that woman suffrage is now inevitable, and the agitation has spread all over Europe. It is red hot in France. In Finland all men and women over 24 have just been given votes, and the Russian duma has unanimously demanded the same thing for Russia.

I hope the women of England will get the suffrage, but I hope they will not get it soon. An agitation like this is just what women need. It is teaching them to think and to rebel, which Bakunin truly said were the two most important things in the world. No saying what they will soon be thinking about. Now that they do not recognize man-made law some very bold ones may begin to get a little doubtful about man-made morality. Shocking thought!

* * *

Another event is the formation of the Anti-Puritan League in England, which has already been joined by many persons. I understand it will take up a good many subjects, but the sex question will not be overlooked. I do not expect anything very radical from it, but it will at least hold in check anything like Comstockism.

The more one knows about Europe the more one deplores the miserable incapacity of American radicals for organization. In England, France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and I think Switzerland, there are neo-Malthusian leagues under one name or another. The result is that in most of those countries there is perfect freedom to advertise and sell preventives. In England they are displayed in the windows of stores, with a description of their object in large letters. In Spain, the America of Europe, a desperate struggle is going on over this matter, but a Spanish jury has lately acquitted a man charged with obscenity for advertising preventives. But after all, Spain is not the United States, it is only the nearest European approach to it.

* * *

Dear LUCIFER: In No. 1068 Joe Trounson pounces on me for my conceit in claiming that God watches over me. From this I gather that in No. 1065, which I have never seen, there must have been an extract from the letter in which I said that God kept me

from going to San Francisco the night of the earthquake. In explanation let me say that that letter was not intended for publication, but was a private one to Lillian Harman, who knows me personally, and knows just how to take anything I say about God.

Some readers may think this explanation unnecessary, but I realize how important it is. Nowadays the preachers are trying to prove that Washington and Jefferson were deeply religious men, and in another hundred years there will be great controversies about the religious beliefs of Moses and Lillian Harman, and the other free-lovers of our time. I can see what a splendid chance my letter would give to some Talmage or Torrey of the twenty-first century to preach a sermon on "The Piety of the Early Varietists." What a fine opening it would give for a passage like this:

"That LUCIFER held the same views as many of the early Christians, and some of the religious sects of the Renaissance and the Reformation, should convince the most sceptical that Moses Harman and his assistants were humble and earnest Christians. But if further evidence is needed it is found in the letter of R. B. Kerr, which appeared in LUCIFER just after the San Francisco earthquake. There had been a series of debates on free-love at the San Francisco free-thought meetings, which were attended by great multitudes, and at which devout men and women of God, like Lydia Todd, Lois Waisbrooker, Dora Forster and R. B. Kerr, made speeches; but they were vehemently opposed by all the leading freethinkers in San Francisco, who held that any and all discussion of the sex question was utterly opposed to freethought principles. As a result the majority of San Franciscans remained unconverted to free-love (except on the sly), at which God was so angry that three days after the last of these discussions he destroyed San Francisco, that great city, with fire and brimstone. Howbeit R. B. Kerr, one of the Noahs or Lots of that time, had intended to go over to San Francisco the night of the earthquake, but God warned him not to, and he desisted. This shows plainly that all the Luciferites were pious Christian men and women, and that their persecution was caused entirely by ungodly men like John Most, Eugene Macdonald and the San Francisco freethinkers, who dominated the public opinion of that day." To prevent such a serious perversion of history let me explain that when I speak of God I do so just as I should speak of Santa Claus or Father Christmas. R. B. KERR.

Victoria, B. C.

RECENT PHASES OF THE BATTLE FOR FREEDOM.

The battle over freedom of speech has recently assumed new and interesting forms. A New York state court dismissed charges against a theatrical company for producing the Bernard Shaw play, "Mrs. Warren's Profession," on the ground that it was not obscene within the meaning of the law. The trial judge took occasion to intimate that, as a disagreeable presentation of a disagreeable subject, it was not good art—a criticism which applies with equal (that is, considerable) force to the best known writings of the greatest modern novelists, as Zola and Tolstoy. But "obscene" means adapted to excite lasciviousness in susceptible minds; and "Mrs. Warren's Profession" is not adapted to excite lasciviousness, but only disgust. This just and important distinction would have vindicated the Markland letter if it had been drawn. The federal courts are less scrupulous than those of the states. Since they have, as Senator Carpenter said, "no jury trial," irresponsibility makes them arrogant and subservient, two qualities which go admirably together. Hence their favor with promoters of the Movement in Favor of Ignorance.

It seems, however, that even the federal courts, when a Phillips or a Benedict is not on the bench, are a little averse to pronouncing that obscene whose treatment of disagreeable subjects must excite, not lasciviousness, but horror, indignation, or disgust; for promoters of the Movement in Favor of Ignorance are trying to have the word "disgusting" inserted in the list of methods tabooed by federal law. The way in which such legislation usually goes through makes it probable they may succeed.

* * *

We do not expect as much good or harm from laws as most of our neighbors. But laws for the promotion of ignorance at least cause individual suffering; and every check they encounter is at least an index of awakening public intelligence. It is therefore encouraging to note that since holding up LUCIFER was discontinued the censorship has received another black eye. The banker Lewis, whose new enterprise, the People's Bank, was destroyed last year by a fraud order, has received an amount of public support which compelled Cortelyou to put him again *communicado* (May, 1906), and to order an investigation, which Mr. Lewis promises us, through his paper, the "Woman's Magazine," will startle the country.

Evidently no radical results are to be expected from this. But Congressman Crumpacker, of Indiana, has introduced a bill guaranteeing the common law right of jury trial in fraud cases, notwithstanding the infamous decision of a Roosevelt judge in Lewis' demurrer. It is opposed by the yellow press (see a recent article in "Collier's Weekly"). We ought to back it. For purposes of this sort I advise addressing members of both houses, and do so myself upon occasion. The distinguished Minnesota physician, Malchow, convicted under the Comstock law, has not only been refused justice by Roosevelt, but this insolent ignoramus and demagogue took the occasion to blackguard the two senators from Minnesota in characteristic fashion for presenting the petition (signed by the governor and other principal citizens of their state). The result of my correspondence with them is to ascertain that one of the senators (Clapp) took his kicking like a cur; but the other (Nelson) shows a proper spirit. He thanked me for giving him a full history of "Comstockery, the world's joke at expense of the United States"; and is a good man to interest. As for Roosevelt, the advantages of appeals to his intelligence are fully described in the sixth verse of the seventh chapter of the gospel according to St. Matthew.

C. L. JAMES.

PRUDERY EXPLAINED.

Why the bees should pamper their mothers whilst we pamper only our operatic prima donnas is a question worth reflecting on. Our notion of treating a mother is not to increase her supply of food, but to cut it off by forbidding her to work in a factory for a month after her confinement. Everything that can make birth a misfortune to the parents as well as a danger to the mother is conscientiously done. When a great French writer, Emil Zola, alarmed at the sterilization of his nation, wrote an eloquent and powerful book to restore prestige of parentage, it was at once assumed in England that a work of this character, with such a title as "Fecundity," was too abominable to be translated, and that any attempt to deal with the relations of the sexes from any other than the voluptuary or romantic point of view must be sternly put down. Now, if this assumption were really founded on public opinion, it would indicate an attitude of disgust and resentment towards the life force that could only arise in a diseased and moribund community in which Ibsen's Hedda Gabler would be the typical woman. But it has no vital foundation at all. The prudery of the newspapers is, like the prudery of the dinner table, a mere difficulty of education and language. We are not taught to think decently on these subjects, and consequently, we have no language for them, except indecent language. We, therefore, have to declare them unfit for public discussion, because the only terms in which we can conduct the discussion are unfit for public use. Physiologists, who have a technical vocabulary at their disposal, find no difficulty; and masters of language who think decently can write popular stories like Zola's "Fecundity" or Tolstoi's "Resurrection" without giving the smallest offense to readers who can also think decently. But the ordinary modern journalist, who has never discussed such matters, except in ribaldry, cannot write a simple comment on a divorce case without a conscious shamefulness or a furtive facetiousness that makes it impossible to read the comment aloud in company. All this ribaldry and prudery (the two are the same) does not mean that people do not feel decently on the subject; on the contrary, it is just the depth and seriousness of our feeling that makes its desecration by vile language and coarse humor intolerable; so that at last we cannot bear to have it spoken of at all because only one in a thousand can speak of it without wounding our self-respect, especially the self-respect of women. Add to the horrors of popular language the horrors of popular poverty. In crowded populations poverty destroys the possibility of cleanliness; and in the absence of cleanliness many of the natural conditions of life become offensive and noxious, with the result that at last the association of uncleanliness with these natural conditions becomes so overpowering that among civilized people (that is, people massed in the labyrinths of slums we call cities), half their bodily life becomes a guilty secret, unmentionable except to the doctor in emergencies; and Hedda Gabler shoots herself because maternity is so unladylike. In short, popular prudery is only a mere incident of popular squalor: the subjects which it taboos remain the most interesting and earnest of subjects in spite of it.—*G. Bernard Shaw.*

Without hearts there is no home.—*Byron.*

LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY AT 500 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.
TELEPHONE: ASHLAND 1727.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year .....$1.00 Three months.....25 cents
Six months .....50 cents Single copies.....5 cents

Hereafter LUCIFER will not be sent to subscribers after expiration of subscription except by special request. Please compare number on your wrapper with whole number of paper, and if your subscription is about to expire notify us if you wish to continue to receive LUCIFER.

Money orders and drafts should be made payable to Moses Harman. Please do not send personal checks, as a discount is charged by the banks for collection.

Letters for LUCIFER should be addressed to Moses Harman, 500 Fulton street, Chicago.

EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE:
E. C. WALKER, 244 WEST 143D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

LUCIFER: ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE.

LUCIFER—The planet Venus; so called from its brightness.—*Webster's Dictionary.*

LUCIFEROUS—Giving light; affording light or the means of discovery.—*Same.*

LUCIFIC—Producing light.—*Same.*

LUCIFORM—Having the form of light.—*Same.*

The name Lucifer means Light-Bringing or Light-Bearing, and the paper that has adopted this name stands for Light against Darkness—for Reason against Superstition—for Science against Tradition—for Investigation and Enlightenment against Credulity and Ignorance—for Liberty against Slavery—for Justice against Privilege.

CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, OR OF THE PRESS; OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.—*First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.*

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF WOMAN.

If a woman wants marriage, and wants to make her marriage a religious sacrament, let her do so. If another woman wishes to have the sanction of a magistrate or a judge of probate, let her have it. If she wishes to make an individualistic contract with a man without witnesses, it is her right to do so. If she wishes to claim her natural right to motherhood or to sex-association without any contract whatever, holding herself responsible to natural law, natural justice, for the consequences of such association, it is nobody's business but her own. From my point of view, our marriage laws are all wrong; they are the mediate or immediate cause of more suffering, debasement and crime than any other laws or class of laws; but I recognize also that, like all other laws and superstitions, they are the result of natural evolution, and that by natural evolution must they be eliminated or destroyed. As in the elimination of our iniquitous land laws, money laws, tariff laws, etc., the first thing to do is to create a desire for something better. Next, to show that something better can only be obtained by a recognition of the demands of natural right, natural justice. To create such a desire, and to show what the demands of natural justice mean or require, is the present mission of LUCIFER THE LIGHT-BEARER.

The address of Joseph Errant in Chicago raises several questions of much importance as well as of much difficulty of solution.

First, and somewhat incidentally to the main question, we would ask, if it be right and proper that the law should make provision whereby the "unmarried mother may take proceedings, either before or after the child is born, to place the father under bonds to pay money for the support of the child"—if the unmarried mother can lawfully and rightfully do this, would it not also be proper and right and should it not be lawful for the *married* mother to do so too? The common impression seems to be that the marriage bond supersedes the necessity of placing the putative father under other bonds for the support of his child or his children—that his *promise* to the priest or magistrate to love, cherish and protect his wife includes the obligation to properly support his child or his children if any should be born to him, and that his solemn promise or oath is a sufficient guarantee to the woman for its fulfillment.

But how does this theory work in practice? Let the thousands of half-starved, half-clad, uneducated children of married mothers give answer. When the husband plays truant and deserts his family, or, worse still, when he proves himself a loafer, a deadbeat, consuming upon his vices most of his scanty earnings, what recourse have the injured wife and children? If the mother were not married to the shiftless spendthrift or vicious sponge in the shape of a man, she could at least refuse longer to be his sex-slave—could refuse to bear him any more children to grow up in poverty and vice or to die from neglect. She might be able, if unmarried, even under our unjustly discriminative industrial system, to support herself and one child, but what can she do with four, five, six or more children, all under ten years of age, as often happens in marriage?

It is true that in some states a divorce is allowed the married woman whose husband notoriously fails to provide for his family, but how many wronged women will avail themselves of such relief? Marriage to most women is a sacrament, an oath, a bond to be dissolved only by death, or by dishonor, to them worse than death. "For better or for worse, till death do you part," are words of fearful import, and rather than seek relief by divorce most women will be true to that bond till death brings release.

But all this is incidental rather than vitally important to the main questions that are just now receiving much attention from the Society for Ethical Culture in Chicago, and from the clergy and newspapers of that and other cities. The lecture of Mr. Errant is only one of hundreds that have lately been delivered by eminent men and women in regard to the various forms of sexual and social evils. Mr. Errant seems to have much faith in "law" as a cure for these evils, but thinks the laws, as well as public opinion, "need great revision on these questions." As the law now stands, he says, when an unmarried woman seeks to place the responsibility upon the father of her child, "the attack is always made upon the woman's chastity, because, forsooth, the policy of the law has been to virtually compel a woman who brought a charge against a man to prove herself chaste."

To determine, then, whether public opinion and the laws need revision or not it would seem that some definition is necessary. We must know what is meant by "a woman's chastity." And upon this definition, as upon a pivot, turns the whole controversy of woman's rights and wrongs in the sex-relations.

The lecturer himself has given us a pointer or two, perhaps unwittingly, that leads at once, as we think, to the correct definition of the terms "chaste" and "chastity," as applied to woman, as when he says: "The law and public opinion should unite in recognizing the sacredness of motherhood wherever it may be found."

Now, if motherhood is *always sacred*, then such words as "bastard," "whoredom," etc., must lose their present meaning, and a woman cannot be considered unchaste, lewd or impure simply because she becomes a mother outside of wedlock. If motherhood be always sacred, then the necessary processes or acts that lead to or culminate in motherhood cannot be unholy or "unchaste" processes or acts.

Follow this simple statement or proposition as to the "sacredness of motherhood wherever found" to its logical sequences and it means neither more nor less than the sacredness of womanhood—*sacredness of woman* as the mother of humanity. It means also the *sovereignty of woman over her own person*, for in no other way can the sacredness of womanhood, of motherhood, be properly maintained and defended. Self-ownership of woman means or includes the right to dispose of her selfhood—of her entire person—as she may think proper, without consulting any one but the individual whose equal right to self-ownership may be jeopardized or imperiled by her election; and the right to dispose of her person or to choose *once*, involves and includes the right to dispose and to choose an indefinite number of times.

If the sacredness of motherhood includes and requires self-ownership, self-control, it also includes and requires the ownership and control of the offspring of her person, of her body. When man endures half the pain, the labor, the peril of bringing a child into the world he can then claim half-ownership in the offspring of which he may be the actual or the putative father, and not till then. This view would seem to settle the question of "responsibility" for the parentage and for the support of the child. Without ownership of some sort, responsibility for care and for support cannot be justly predicated or charged. Natural affection will prompt the father to assist in the support of both mother and child, but natural justice will give him no control over either because of or in reward for

such aid. It is this claim to authority over mother and child, because of the alleged support given them in their helplessness and because of the assumed superiority of fatherhood over motherhood, that has made slaves and drudges of women and children in all past times.

Our solution, then, of the question of "responsibility" for the birth of a child and for its support and proper education (the fixing of which responsibility seems to be the chief concern of Mr. Errant and his brother reformers) would be simply this:

First.—The repeal or abolition of all artificial (man-made) restrictions or control of the sex relations of women and men, thus allowing natural selection, natural affection, to do its legitimate work.

To secure this repeal, this abolition, woman must lead the way—man *will not*, simply because these artificial restrictions were made by man for his own benefit—that is, for the purpose of perpetuating his power over woman. In the language of Laura Cummings, "*woman must save woman*," and the only way to save woman from the hells to which man has assigned her is—as all great reforms in the past have been won—by *ignoring*, by *repudiating* and trampling under foot these man-made restrictions. Woman must be a rebel and must be sustained in her rebellion by her sister woman. No bad laws ever were repealed until they were ignored and disregarded by the victims of these laws.

Second.—Constructively: To take the place of the artificial laws and customs thus abolished, let *education* and a sense of responsibility to self and to natural law be substituted. Let girls (and boys, too) be taught, as soon as they can understand language, all that is known or can be known in regard to "motherhood," in regard to the use and the natural consequences of the abuse of their bodies—including, as the most important, the reproductive system.—*Moses Harman, in Lucifer, Feb. 8, 1889.*

LIBERTY AND LICENTIOUSNESS.

The utmost concern is expressed for the liberty of the press, and the utmost horror for its licentiousness; but then, by the licentiousness of the press is meant every disclosure by which any abuse is brought to light and exposed to shame; by the liberty of the press is meant only publications from which no such inconvenience is to be apprehended; and the fallacy consists in employing the sham approbation of liberty as a mask for the real opposition to all free discussion.

To write a pamphlet so ill that nobody will read it; to animadvert in terms so weak and insipid upon great evils, that no disgust is excited at the vice, and no apprehension in the evil-doer, is a fair use of the liberty of the press, and is not only pardoned by the friends of government, but draws from them the most fervent eulogism. The licentiousness of the press consists in doing the thing boldly and well, in striking terror unto the guilty, and in rousing the attention of the public to the defense of their highest interests. This is the licentiousness of the press held in the greatest horror by timid and corrupt men, and punished, by semi-animous, semi-cadaverous judges, with a captivity of many years.—*Jeremy Bentham.*

When Jeremy Bentham, a learned English jurist of the last century, said, "By the licentiousness of the press is meant every disclosure by which any abuse is brought to light and exposed to shame," he must have had in his prophetic eye the men who are now trying to put LUCIFER'S editors and publishers behind prison bars for plain speaking against the horrible abuses of the present day.—*Moses Harman, in Lucifer, Feb. 8, 1889.*

THE CONSOLATIONS OF RELIGION.

When children succumb to inhospitable conditions of life in this world, religion offers consolation in the assurance that God has called these little ones to join the angelic hosts around his throne; if they live to grow up to continued deprivation, religion exhorts them to be content "in that state of life unto which it hath pleased God to call" them, thus throwing all the responsibility for the world's misery upon an unknown creator, just as the Mormons are said to justify their peculiar institution by the theory that innumerable souls are waiting to be born that they may glorify God and enjoy him forever, and therefore it is well-pleasing to him for human beings to furnish these spirits with mortal bodies as rapidly as possibly.—*Elizabeth H. Evans.*

All the selfish propensities, the self-worship, the unjust self-preference, which exists among mankind, have their source and root in and derive their principal nourishment from the present constitution of the relation between men and women.—*John Stuart Mill.*

A VICTIM OF THE POSTAL INQUISITION.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR OF LUCIFER.

Today Moses Harman is 75 years 9 months and 22 days old. He has served 157 days of his sentence to imprisonment for one year at hard labor.

His crime was the admission into LUCIFER of a serious discussion of the marital relations of men and women.

One of the two articles on which prosecution was based was written in criticism of LUCIFER and was published because the editor believes that only through free expression of opinion is the truth to be reached.

The other article was written by an elderly woman, a mother of several children—a grandmother as well—in advocacy of self-control by men and women.

Address personal letters to Moses Harman, 5326, Box 7, Leavenworth, Kan. Purely private subjects should be avoided, as all letters are read by prison officials and withheld if not approved. Do not ask questions requiring answer. All such questions, matter pertaining to LUCIFER, changes of addresses, etc., should be sent to the office, 500 Fulton street, Chicago.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR.

U. S. P., LEAVENWORTH, KAN., July 22, 1906.

Many thanks, dear daughter, for good letters since I wrote you two weeks ago—the last dated July 19. Glad to hear that everything is going on so well at home. Though not allowed to see its radiant face, I rejoice to know that our Son of the Morning continues to make its appearance prompt to time every other week. This is more than could be said of it when *I* was manager. Glad to know that friends far and near are doing their part so well that there is no lack of the needful to meet current expenses of publication. Glad to know that your health continues normal notwithstanding unusual strain, from sickness in family and lack of usual help.

Hope the summer in Chicago will not be uncomfortably or unhealthfully warm. Here at the U. S. P. the weather has been pleasantly cool most of the time since my transfer from Joliet, Ill. The hospital, of which I am still an inmate, occupies part of the third floor of the main building, and the prison itself is located on a bluff

or high ridge, hence we get good circulation of air most of the time.

My report of health, two weeks ago, was of the *pessimistic* rather than optimistic order, if I mistake not. Since that date there has been decided improvement in my physical condition. I cough but little now and the catarrh of stomach is less constantly in evidence. My appetite is normal, for my one meal a day—dinner. I get milk, sweet and sour; some raw fruit, and nearly always stewed peaches; rice, potatoes, etc. Old-fashioned corn bread (maize) twice a week, of which, as you know, I am very fond. Altogether I have good reason to feel optimistic once more, and to hope that my present term of imprisonment will not kill me, nor leave me so near dead that I cannot do a little more work, with hand or brain or both.

Much of this improvement is due, as I think, to the kindness of friends, far and near, who continue to send letters—hopeful, cheerful, loving letters—full of encouragement to hold out bravely till old Father Time shall give the order to the prison keepers to open the gate for U. S. "Convict" No. 5326—which order is now set for December 26 of this current year. When I contrast the fate of the average prisoner here and at Joliet, in regard to letters and visits, with my own, I feel almost guilty of *selfish monopoly*. Many prisoners get no letters at all, for months or years; others do not average one letter per month. Some *never* get a visit from friends. When an inmate of the U. S. P. eleven years ago I had many visitors —several visits per week, often; but now the rule is *one* visit in four weeks, except by special permission of the warden. Thus far, and by special privilege, I have had two visits of half hour each from Son George, whose home is at Valley Falls, Kan., thirty-five miles west of the U. S. P.

How many letters have knocked at the prison door, written for my eye, and failed to gain admittance, in the two weeks just past, I have no means of knowing, but here is the list of those that reached my hand: Susan Swaysgood, 1; Philip G. Peabody, 2; Bert Griffin, 1; Elizabeth H. Russell, 1; N. C. Greene, 1; Emma Greene, 1; S. O. Bishop, 1; Sarah C. Campbell, 1; Frank D. Blue, 1; "The Chaplain" (A. Johnson), 1; Carrie Gross, 1; Otto Bobsien, 1; Ada Morley, 2; M. R. Leverson, M. D., 1; Ed. W. Chamberlain, 1; Lois Waisbrooker, 2; Lydia L. Lamb, 1; George F. Patch, 1; Annie B. Fish, 1; H. Hansen (Colo.), 1; Lulu McClarke, 1; Ella Slater, 1; Hulda P. Loomis, 1; George B. Wheeler, 1; Ella Kautz, 1; Maggie Dimmick, 1; Fannie Bellin, 1; Virgie C. Moon, 1; Ollie Steedman, 1; H. W. Boozer, 1; H. M. Addison, 1; Annie E. Parkhurst, 1; George Bedborough, 2; Lillian Harman, 6. J. Francis Ruggles, of Bronson, Mich., writes that he sent me a book of songs. It has not been delivered to me. Please thank Brother Ruggles for me, and if possible, write a few lines to each of the writers just named, thanking them in my name, and asking them to kindly continue to remember the "prisoner of hope" in the U. S. P. at *Leavenworth, not Fort* Leavenworth, as first stated. Many of these writers sent copies of the songs I asked for while at Joliet, also copies of songs I did not ask for, but which are appreciated all the same—so many, in fact, that I shall have to ask the writers to wait till I am free again, when I hope to answer, personally, all who responded to my request for songs that I hoped would help to break the monotony of breaking stone with a steel hammer in a close yard without shelter from the sun except a *straw hat*. The promised *canopy* failed to materialize while I helped to furnish broken stone for the Illinois railways.

Please thank Oscar Schleif for the very fine photo of himself, and say no letter came with the photo. It was sent from *Clamenton*, N. J.

Dr. Immanuel Pfeiffer, vice-president and general manager of the Postal Reform League, sent me a registered letter dated July 3. It reached my hand two days ago, on the 20th, having been delayed and reëntered at Joliet, Ill. He enclosed an important clipping from a New York paper and suggests that I register my replies to his letters. Please thank him for me and say I will try to comply with his suggestion, but that I fail to see how *registration* will help me to reach him, though it may help *him* to reach *me*.

After long waiting I am now getting the daily and Sunday "Tribune" and weekly "Public" (Chicago), but the "Scientific American" (New York), paid ahead six months, does not come. Neither does "Progressive Thinker" (Chicago), nor several weeklies and monthlies that came to me regularly at Joliet.

Sheet full.

Hopefully, gratefully ever, M. H.

The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man.—*Shaw.*

FRAUD ORDERS.

Our Washington correspondent, in recently synopsizing the Crumpacker bill to limit the power of the postoffice department in issuing "fraud orders," so called, noted that the sentiment of congress in favor of providing a judicial review of the edicts under which the use of the mails is denied is steadily growing. Mr. Crumpacker's proposal is to make the issuing of a fraud order dependent on the approval of a court. The postmaster general must give notice of intention to cut off the privilege of the mails, and the party affected has fifteen days within which to go into court to prove, if he can, his right to continued postal facilities. The court will hear all the evidence and if it concurs in the opinion of the postmaster general will make an order accordingly. If it finds that party whose correspondence it is proposed to exclude is not engaged in any fraudulent enterprise it will prohibit the issuance of a fraud order.

Mr. Crumpacker, in the document accompanying his bill, which has been favorably reported to the house, severely criticises the methods now in practice as compelling the citizen to prove his innocence of fraud without affording him an opportunity to see the evidence against him. This evidence is confidential and has been brought together by postoffice inspectors, and inspectors are apt to consider success as a duty and conviction as success. Moreover, it is an act of grace in the postmaster general to accord a hearing. It is a privilege granted; not a right recognized. At present the only remedy within the reach of the citizen who feels himself aggrieved is to go into court and seek an injunction against the enforcement, not the issuance, of a "fraud order." Usually the quest is fruitless, as the burden of judicial decisions is that the use of the mails is not a vested or property right. The methods of the postoffice department in executing one of the attributes of sovereignty can, however, be regulated by statute. Hence, Mr. Crumpacker seeks to curtail the autocratic tendency in the way proposed.

That the government has a right to protect the citizen and itself against the employment of the mails for the purpose of working a fraud may be admitted without the admission conceding the propriety of all the methods followed in the pursuance of this purpose. The power the postmaster general now has in the matter may be lodged in safe hands, but a successor might be moved by a spirit of inquisitorial autocracy that would lead to the gravest public inconvenience. If there should be no tribunal to appeal to, it might be possible for a postmaster general to hold that all speculation was stock gambling and that an inducement to investment attended only by the adverse chances that are liable in the most promising market was a fraudulent prospectus and to be cast out of the mails entirely. It must be remembered, too, that the denial of the privilege of the mails extends to all the correspondence of the party affected, and that letters having no relation to the business charged with being fraudulent come under the interdiction. The man against whom a fraud order is issued is, as Mr. Crumpacker in effect says, isolated from his kind, so far as the postoffice department can accomplish his isolation. He is thenceforth under a stigma.

The question considered in its broadest sense concerns more than the prosperity or expediency of the methods of an executive department of the government. As the law stands now it may easily infringe the rights of the citizens, the liberty of the individual. If a citizen desires to try some panacea for his real or fancied ills, as he chooses to purchase it through the mails, he has offended no law, and where in the constitution is there found any obligation on him to accept as final the verdict of a postoffice inspector that the assumed remedy is "fraudulent"? His money comes back to him, to be sure, but that circumstance is little likely to reconcile him to the paternalism that tells him the government will not facilitate the purchase of somebody's sure cure for indigestion. Protection against efforts to work deliberate fraud through the mails may be a legitimate function of the government, but the progress of paternalism in this country is so rapid, and the transition to autocracy is so easy, that the adoption of Mr. Crumpacker's proposal may be but a timely measure for checking a dangerous tendency. Judges are fallible, but they are free from the influences to which postoffice inspectors are liable. The inspectors are removable, and it is nothing wonderful if they are inspired by an earnest desire to report in harmony with the policy of him who possesses the power of removal.—*Boston Evening Transcript.*

Truth does not do so much good in the world as its appearances do evil. * * * Our wisdom is not less at the mercy of fortune than our property.—*Rochefoucauld's "Maxims and Reflections upon Man."*

VARIOUS VOICES.

Full name and address of writers in this department can generally be obtained on application to the editor.

We are always glad to receive calls from friends visiting the city. Take the Lake street elevated, stop at Ashland avenue, walk one block east, then one block north. Or take Fulton street electric car west and stop at St. John's place, alighting in front of our house. The Lake street electric and Paulina street cars also pass within a block of our residence.

J. M. CRANE, Chicago.—I send you $5 for five copies of LUCIFER for one year. I want the four extra copies for distribution among persons who never have seen the paper.

MRS. NELLIE PITCHER, Rapid City, S. D.—Enclosed find $1 to apply on my subscription. Wish I could make it $100,000 instead, as my deepest sympathy is ever with you, your noble father and the cause you advocate.

F. E. LEONARD, Cestos, Okla.—I wish to express my approval of the plan to print Moses Harman's portrait in each issue of LUCIFER while he is serving his sentence in prison, and will agree to contribute at least $2 towards the extra expense of such printing.

FRED H. BERGMANN, Chicago.—Please find enclosed $3 for LUCIFER and its cause. I beg you to forward my fraternal greeting to your esteemed father. Words cannot express my admiration for this gallant fighter for liberty. His persecutors and enemies have my full contempt!

C. F. CIAMPA, Boston.—Enclosed find $2, for which you may renew my subscription to LUCIFER for one year and use the other dollar to help along the cause for which your father is now suffering in prison. I hope that Mr. Harman will come out of his torture just as strong as ever to continue his brilliant work of education.

DR. GEORGE A. BRADFORD, Columbia, Mo.—A man called at my office the other day to consult me about his sick child. I afterwards showed him the picture of Moses Harman, and read him some short notices in LUCIFER. He immediately gave me one dollar and said: "I want you to write and have that paper sent me at once." So please find enclosed postoffice order for $1. After this I will certainly show the paper to others.

F. FROMMEL, Charleston, Ill.—I am in sympathy with your father and his writings. I know him personally. I heard him make a talk in St. Louis at the convention during the world's fair. I admired then his pluck and courage to express his convictions for the cause he stands for, and send you my sincere thanks for what you do for your dear father and his cause. I would like to say more, but find my pen too weak to express my thoughts and feelings in letters. I enclose $1, for which I wish you would send your dear father something he is fond of. I hope to be able to see him again at our next convention in Chicago. I will be a subscriber to LUCIFER as long as I live. I am only sorry I did not get acquainted sooner with the publication. I shall try and get some friends to subscribe for LUCIFER.

J. L., Abilene, Texas.—I see my figures on the wrapper label are up and I must "come across." Find enclosed 50 cents to keep LUCIFER coming a while longer. It is simply outrageous that your good old father has to suffer incarceration and bear the punishment of physical labor for trying to do good. I am almost ready to say that the wages of righteousness is death. I wish I were financially able to help relieve the situation.

P. S.—I inclose a humorous clipping in which there is a point:

The Gardener (tendering his resignation)—No, sir. It's the missus I can't abide. She's got inter the 'abit o' talkin' ter me jest like wot she does ter you. She fergits I can leave when I wants ter. —*Pick Me Up.*

J. FRANCIS RUGGLES, Bronson, Mich.—It is some years since I have read LUCIFER until recently, but I observe that you still keep the watch fires of liberty and genius brightly burning. Progress progresses slowly but surely, and we see the once "awful doctrine" of equal moral responsibility of the sexes being championed and popularized by thinkers of various cults, and even a reverend doctor of divinity has published a series of invaluable works for the sexual education and betterment of all man and womankind. I have never perused anything vile, coarse or indecent from your editor's pen, and unless the proscribed articles are much different from the general trend of matter in your columns they can't be exceedingly bad. At any rate it is really very cruel that your aged father must suffer so vicariously for the writings of others, and for possible error of judgment in admitting their contributions to his columns. Other editors, however, err occasionally, but are not incarcerated or persecuted for a lifetime in consequence thereof. Upon the great question of respectful free discussion of all subjects, and the right to be heard on the topic of sexual enlightenment, your father is radically right, though at enmity with the fossilized superstitions, prejudices and pruderies of the ages. I enclose copy of a letter written him, also $1 for your paper beginning with No. 1069.

J. D. WILHITE, San Francisco, Cal.—Some years ago I was a subscriber to LUCIFER and enjoyed most of it very much, but became offended at what I considered the hostile attitude of Moses Harman toward the socialist propaganda, and so hastily and, as I now realize, rudely ordered the paper discontinued. But I have remained intensely devoted to the central idea of LUCIFER—i. e., intelligent freedom in the sexual relations—and have also admired the stand of Moses and Lillian Harman on many other points. My sympathies have been strongly aroused by the present imprisonment of Mr. Harman, though I have been up to the present unable to extend any financial assistance. I now desire to express my sincere regret for my former letter ordering the discontinuance of the paper, and to be again enrolled in LUCIFER'S family. Enclosed herewith find money order for $1, for which please send LUCIFER to the address given below for one year.

* * *

[This letter was withheld by the prison authorities at Joliet.]

My Dear Mr. Harman: As this letter has to pass through the hands of the man of "god," I will refrain from expressing the resentment natural to one who learns that one of his best and most respected friends is in the clutches of the Beast. Moreover, I am firmly convinced that anger which expresses itself merely in hot-mouthed denunciation and abuse is unphilosophical and inadequate. If we all follow the line of least resistance and do the things we are forced to by our heredity and environment, then why should we feel contempt or bitter hatred for those who do malicious and unjust acts? Rather should we endeavor to make our persecutors and those who support them see the evil effects of their conduct, and by this process of education (which is, of course, a part of their environment) inspire them with higher ideals than throttling free speech and murdering or imprisoning men and women.

I shall never forget your kindness to me when I first came to Chicago. I regret that I am unable to reciprocate as I would wish. Verily, what the clericals would have us believe are Christian virtues —viz.: kindness and brotherly love—are practised only by Atheists and Anarchists.

I receive LUCIFER regularly and it is well filled with interesting and instructive reading matter, so you need have no fear that the light from the Light-Bearer will become dim while you are in gaol.

I attend the Manhattan Liberal Club regularly and see Mr. Walker always at his post by the door. He looks to be in fine health. From time to time I meet friends from Chicago at the club. Barnard gave a fine lecture a couple of months or so ago, and I have met a number of other Chicago radicals. Since she returned to New York, Mrs. Johnson gave me the news from your household. I was glad to hear that your courage and spirits were still good, and I feel as long as this is so your imprisonment will not break you down.

The picture of yourself that is being published in LUCIFER is certainly a fine one. I wasn't surprised at your looking so happy after Mrs. Johnson told me what a fine grandchild you had.

I am surprised that you are not allowed to write. The future will your paper, or letters. I don't know much about prisons, but I suppose the guests were allowed to write as much as they wished. I am not surprised, however, that they forbid criticism of the prison rule. I do not suppose any of us are overfond of criticism under some circumstances. Hoping that your health may continue good, and with best wishes, I remain, sincerely your friend,

JOHN E. BOULTENHOUSE.

Nothing, indeed, is much more curious than to reflect that if the pope himself had been born a savage he would now have been asking the blessing of strange gods over cannibal banquets; and if Mr. Spurgeon had been born in Islam he would now have been defending polygamy, and holding forth as a Mohammedan apostle.—*Lewis Thornton.* And if Anthony Comstock had been born in Southern China he would now be exhibiting the beauties of his human form in the nudities which are there customary.—*S.*

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Our Advancing Postal Censorship.

BY LOUIS F. POST.

An extremely powerful review of the administrative process, which is rapidly Russianizing these United States. Contains a correspondence with the postal department in reference to the attempted suppression of LUCIFER, and Mr. Post's conclusions therefrom.

"The confiscation by postal clerks of any publication, for any cause, without specific charges, without opportunity to the publisher to be heard, without the verdict of a jury, without appeal, without any of the ordinary safeguards of personal rights and private property, and consequently without any assurance of guilt, is an ominous fact. No matter how objectionable or even dangerous a paper's teachings may seem to the censors, no matter how offensive its language in their estimation, so palpable an invasion of the commonest rights of citizenship is a direct menace to the independent press of the country."

Price, 3c each; 25c a dozen.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Administrative Process of the Postal Department.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT, BY THADDEUS BURR WAKEMAN.

This is a most effective "missionary document" relative to the attempted suppression of free speech by the postal censorship. It contains half-tone portraits of the author and of Moses Harman. We want this letter distributed as widely and as effectively as possible, and as some who might be able to distribute it may not be able to buy we have felt reluctant to set a price on it. Let such not hesitate to order any quantity desired, even though unable to send money. For those who can afford to help bear the expense of publication, the price is 5 cents a copy, or 25 cents a dozen.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Marriage in Free Society.

BY EDWARD CARPENTER.

One of the best short works on the subject. A charming little gift book.

"Love is doubtless the last and most difficult lesson that humanity has to learn; in a sense it underlies all the others. Perhaps the time has come for the modern nations when, ceasing to be children, they may even try to learn it."

Daintily printed. Prepaid, 25c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Love's Way to Perfect Humanhood.

BY AGNES BENHAM.

An excellent companion for Carpenter's "Love's Coming of Age." The keynote of the book, found on page 76, reads thus: "The soul itself is pure and heavenly, and if at the moment of conception and through the prenatal time when it is building its earthly house it could meet with entirely responsive and congenial conditions, then would the earth be peopled with a race of gods." Price $1. Published by the author, Agnes Benham, Adelaide, South Australia.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

The Strike of a Sex.

A NOVEL BY GEORGE N. MILLER.

FORTIETH THOUSAND.

"The Strike of a Sex" is a fascinating novel bearing upon the sexual relations. It is a bold protest against the customary life of most married people, and at the same time a prophecy of happier conditions between man and wife. Prepaid, 25c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

The Moods of Life.

BY WILLIAM FRANCIS BARNARD.

A collection of verse which will be sure to attract attention among those who are looking for new poetry. The author has been a contributor to American magazines for several years, and is well known as a poet of modernity with a remarkable gift of imaginative expression. 12mo cloth; gilt title; 160 pages. $1, postpaid.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

The Old God and the New Humanity.

BY WINWOOD READE.

This is a handsome booklet, containing matter taken from "The Martyrdom of Man," Reade's masterpiece. It will be found wonderfully effective as an eye-opener on the question of religion, and will make the reader, like Oliver Twist, call for "more." Price, 10 cents.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

An Essay on the Duty of Civil Disobedience.

BY HENRY D. THOREAU.

A reprint of this classic essay on the supremacy of the individual conscience. Antique paper; artistic covers, dark green on olivine. 10c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

Otto Wettstein,

LIBERAL MAIL-ORDER JEWELER.

and reënter[illegible]t at No. 110 N. Kensington av., La Grange, Cook [illegible]ave you 10 to 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or [illegible]ything in the Jeweler's Line. Write me and receive prices and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

The American Institute of Phrenology.

Incorporated 1866. Session opens the first Wednesday in September. Subjects: Phrenology; the Art of Character Reading; Anatomy; Physiology; Physiognomy; Heredity; Hygiene, etc. Address 24 East 22d street, New York, care of Fowler & Wells Co.

Dr. J. H. Greer, M. D.,

52 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO.

Office Hours—9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m. Telephone Randolph 42.

Philip G. Peabody,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61,
BOSTON, MASS.

Dr. Ogilvie Rice,

DENTIST.
1556 MILWAUKEE AVE., COR. WESTERN, CHICAGO.

1071

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your LUCIFER, your subscription expires with this number.

If a copy of LUCIFER fails to reach you, please order by number or date.

THE BOOK EXCHANGE.

I HAVE AN IDEA.

Most of us have good ideas now and then, but how few of us ever go any further than having the idea!

Now if you think my plan a good one help me to help you.

MY IDEA:

Make a list of all the books, pamphlets, magazines and radical papers you have to sell, exchange or give away and *send me that list.*

Some one has that missing number of LUCIFER, or that book you have been looking for so long is growing dusty on the shelf of some one who would rather have *one of your books in exchange.*

I KNOW BOOKS,

their prices and publishers, and can help you get that book and perhaps sell some of your books at the same time.

THE EXCHANGE

will be made through me and I can save you money and perhaps add to your library at the same time.

MAKE THAT LIST TODAY

if possible. Do it this week without fail and mail to

SAMUEL T. HAMMERSMARK,

206 LINCOLN PLACE, NORWOOD PARK, CHICAGO, ILL.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Woman's Source of Power.

LOVE ATTRACTION, THE FEMININE PRINCIPLE, is the builder of all living forms. LOVE IS THE CREATOR.

In the inception of human life the first step is destructive of a previous condition, but when the work is given into woman's keeping the action is reversed, becomes constructive; from then on till growth ceases the feminine is the predominating power. Here is where the principle which can continue youth should begin its work.

BY LOIS WAISBROOKER.

Price 25 cents. For sale at this office.

Do You Want Free Speech?

BY JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

Concentrated, but comprehensive. It is specially valuable at the present crisis, since it is the only pamphlet exposing the entire conspiracy against free speech in America. The facts it cites are startling, but absolutely verifiable. The brochure is needed by all who would realize whither we are drifting, the magnitude of the issue we are called on to face, the fundamental principles involved in the battle for free speech, and the means of combatting the enemies of liberty. Price, 10 cents.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Free America.

BY BOLTON HALL.

Dedicated "To Those Who Are Poor and Wish to Become Rich, or Who Are Rich and Wish to Become Richer."

The book shows, in an interesting and amusing way, the evils from which we suffer as individuals and as a society, the causes of them and their cure—which is liberty. The illustrations are by Dan Beard. Two hundred and fifteen pages, 18mo. Price, postpaid: Paper, 25 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State.

BY FREDERICK ENGELS.

Chapter titles: Prehistoric Stages; The Family; The Iroquois Gens; The Grecian Gens; Origin of the Attic State; Gens and State in Rome; The Gens Among Celts and Germans; The Rise of the State Among Germans.

217 pages; bound in cloth. Price 60c; postage 5c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Up-to-Date Fables.

BY R. B. KERR.

Contents: The Male Amazons. The Strassburg Geese. Bread Eaten in Secret. The One Tune. A Tale About Noses. The Women and the Wells. Mrs. Grundy's Two Boarding Schools. The Emancipated Horses.

Neatly printed and covered. Price, 25c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Photographs of Moses Harman.

The latest photographs of the editor of LUCIFER, taken alone, and also photographs taken with his infant grandson, are for sale at this office. Price, 25 cents each.